

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 7 are the independent claims. In the Office Action, dated Jan. 3, 2003, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,185,613 (Lawson et al.). The outstanding rejection to the claims is respectfully traversed.

Summary of the Invention

The invention provides a tracking system for a distributed computing environment, such as a peer to peer computing environment, which provides for watching one or more properties of a server resource by a client resource. A property of a resource corresponds to “data related to the resource whose value can be set by that resource during execution of a function of the resource.” That function can be invoked by another software component. The function may be specifically provided to set the value of the property (e.g., a set property function) or may set the value of the property as a side effect.

In one embodiment, a property watching component of the resource tracking system allows client resources to register their interest in receiving notifications when a property of a server resource is set. The client resources also specify the behavior to be performed when the property is set. The property watching component provides a synchronous mechanism for notifying client resources when the property is set. This synchronous mechanism ensures that client resources who are registered to watch a property are notified of the setting of the property before any client resources are notified of a subsequent setting of the property. The property watching component thus provides a mechanism for synchronizing processing among multiple client resources.

Lawson et al.

Lawson et al., on the other hand, relates to an event notification system. Lawson et al. teaches an event notification system that has a two tiered architecture: a local tier with a local registry for event registration and a global tier with a global registry for event registration. In one aspect, Lawson et al. discloses that a check is made to see whether global event notification is implicated before the eventing system notifies clients outside the local tier by reference to the local registry, saving network traffic globally when unnecessary.

However, the claimed subject matter of the present invention, i.e., **property** notification (e.g., beginning on page 56, and elsewhere), is nowhere found in Lawson et al. Indeed, Applicant's disclosure includes a whole different section relating to eventing in the written description beginning on page 61.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The outstanding rejection to claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully traversed.

As alluded to above, application of Lawson et al. to the present claims is inapposite because Lawson et al. relates to an eventing system, not a property notification system. One of ordinary skill in the art can appreciate the difference between a property of an object, and an event in a computing system. In this regard, a property (e.g., "blue" or "dimmed") is a quality or trait belonging to an individual or thing, or an effect that an object has on another object. An event (e.g., "train arrived" or "print finished"), on the other hand, is something that happens, or an occurrence.

As described above, since Lawson et al. relates to an eventing system, and not to registering interests in one or more properties of an object, Lawson et al. cannot be said to

disclose or suggest at least "registering, by a first software component, an interest in watching a property of a second software component and receiving a notification when the property is set" (claim 1) or "for each of a plurality of software components, registering an interest in a property and setting the property a plurality of times and for each setting of the property, notifying each software component of the plurality of software components that the property has been set prior to notifying any software component of the plurality of software components of any later setting of the property" (claim 7).

Applicant respectfully submit no prior art system presented in the Official Action, taken alone or in combination, teaches at least these features of the present invention.

Claims 2-6, 9, 11, 13 and 15 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Claims 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16 depend from claim 7 and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.


DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0681/183208.1  
Application No.: 09/322,457  
Office Action Dated: January 3, 2003

PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submit that Claims 1-16 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: April 25, 2003



---

Thomas E. Watson  
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439